



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/634,501	08/05/2003	Darrell Anderson	Google-54 (GP-064-06-US)	8674
26479	7590	02/10/2006		EXAMINER
STRAUB & POKOTYLO 620 TINTON AVENUE BLDG. B, 2ND FLOOR TINTON FALLS, NJ 07724			ALAUBAIDI, HAYTHIM J	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2168	

DATE MAILED: 02/10/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/634,501	ANDERSON ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Haythim J. Alaubaidi	2161	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 August 2003.
- 2a) This action is FINAL.                    2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-82 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-82 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 05 August 2003 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)                     |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)   | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____  |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>2/28/05</u> . | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
|  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                    |

**DETAILED ACTION**

1. This action is a Non-Final Office Action in regard to Application No. 10634501 Filed on August 05, 2003.
2. Claims 1-82 are presented for examination; claims 1, 13, 42 and 54 are Independent claims.
3. Claims 1-19, 23-32, 35-38, 42-60, 64-73 and 76-79, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Dwight Merriman (U.S. Patent No. 5,948,061 and Merriman hereinafter).
4. Claims 20-22 and 61-63, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Merriman.
5. Claims 33-34, 39-41, 74-75 and 80-82, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Merriman in view of Servan-Schreiber.

***Priority***

6. This application is also a continuation-in-part of Application No. 10375900 filed on February 26, 2003 which is also a continuation-in-part of Application No. 10314427 filed on December 6, 2002 which claims a priority of provisional Application No. 60413536 filed on September 24, 2002. Hence, the Applicant was accorded the benefit of the earlier filing date of September 24, 2002, for that subject matter which was originally presented in that application.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

7. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

8. Claims 29, 30, 70 and 71 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as failing to set forth the subject matter which applicant(s) regard as their invention. The claim language is not clear as to what request is being submitted before the rendering of the document content? Appropriate clarification is required.

9. Regarding claims 34 and 75, the phrase "substantially" renders the claim indefinite because the degree of the term is unclear, for example, how substantial is this concurrent submitting! See MPEP § 2173.05(d).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

10. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

11. Claims 1-19, 23-32, 35-38, 42-60, 64-73 and 76-79, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Dwight Merriman (U.S. Patent No. 5,948,061 and Merriman hereinafter).

Regarding Claims 1, 4-6, 8, 13-16, 23, 42, 45-49, 54-57 and 64 Merriman discloses:

- a) accepting document information, sourced from an application on the client device (Col 2, Lines 15-25; see also Col 2, Lines 65-66; see also Col 3, Lines 5-8; see also Col 3, Lines 24-34);
- b) determining at least one ad relevant to content of the document using at least the accepted document information (Col 2, Lines 25-30; see also Col 3, Lines 12-15; See also Col 3, Lines 34-59, i.e. determine); and
- c) sending the at least one ad determined to the client device (Col 2, Lines 25-38; see also Col 3, Lines 59-63; see also Col 6, Lines 56-69).

Regarding Claims 2 and 43, Merriman discloses wherein the act of determining at least one ad relevant to the content of the document further uses at least ad relevance information (Col 3, lines 34-59; see also Col 6, Lines 12-26).

Regarding Claims 3 and 44, Merriman discloses wherein the ad relevance information includes an ad concept (Col 3, Lines 34-38; see also Col 4, Lines 44-55; see also Col 6, lines 11-26)<sup>1</sup>.

Regarding Claims 7 and 48, Merriman discloses:

- i) using the document identifier to lookup document content relevance information (Col 5, Lines 10-20), and
- ii) using the document content relevance information to determine at least one ad relevant to the content of the document (Col 2, Lines 25-30; see also Col 3, Lines 12-15; See also Col 3, Lines 34-59, i.e. determine).

Regarding Claims 9-12 and 50-53, Merriman discloses browser, browser plug in and a browser toolbar (Col 3, Lines 24-63, specifically Lines 24-26)<sup>2</sup>.

Regarding Claims 17 and 58, Merriman discloses concepts from the content of the received document, wherein the request includes the concepts extracted by the client device (Col 3, Lines 35-38; see also Col 5, Lines 10-15).

Regarding Claims 18 and 59, Merriman discloses at least one of the at least one content-relevant ad received includes rendering the at least one of the at least one content-relevant ad in association with the content of the requested document (Col 2, Lines 25-38; see also Col 3, Lines 59-63; see also Col 6, Lines 56-69).

---

<sup>1</sup> Please note that the Examiner is interpreting the information of Col 4, Lines 44-55 as the "concept" due to the term broadness.

<sup>2</sup> Please note that Netscape Browser and Microsoft Internet Explorer browsers are well known in the art for the ability to support plug-ins and toolbars.

Regarding Claims 19, 24, 60 and 65 Merriman discloses rendering the content of the document in a first window, wherein the at least one of the at least one content-relevant ad received is rendered in a second window (Col 3, Lines 5-15; see also Col 1, Lines 29-44).

Regarding Claims 25-28 and 66-69, the limitations of these claims were disclosed in rejecting the combination of Claims 9-12, 19 and 24 (please see Col 3, Lines 24-63, specifically Lines 24-26; and also see Col 3, Lines 5-15; see also Col 1, Lines 29-44).

Regarding Claims 29-32 and 70-73, Merriman discloses rendering content of the requested document, wherein the act of rendering content of the requested document is initiated before the act of submitting a request (please see Merriman Figure No. 1, Element No. 16 to 20 then 12 to 22 and corresponding text; see also Col 2, Lines 15-36).

Regarding Claims 35-36 and 76-77, Merriman discloses rendering, by the client device, the content of the document in a first part of a browser window, wherein the at least one of the at least one content-relevant ad received is rendered in a second part of the browser window, wherein the second part of the browser window shares no space with the first part of the browser window (Col 3, Lines 5-15; see also Col 1, Lines 29-44; see also Col 2, Lines 15-36).

Regarding Claims 37-38 and 78-79 Merriman discloses wherein the second part of the browser window is a browser chrome part and/or a toolbar of the browser window (Col 3, Lines 24-63, specifically Lines 24-26).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

12. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

13. Claims 20-22 and 61-63, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dwight Merriman (U.S. Patent No. 5,948,061 and Merriman hereinafter).

Regarding Claims 20-22 and 61-63 though Merriman reference discloses examples of locations where an ad maybe displayed (please see Col 1, Lines 32-36). Yet Merriman's reference does not expressly show the rendering location of an ad window compared to the location content of a document, such as a web page window location.

However these differences are only found in the nonfunctional descriptive material and do not alter the functionality of rendering a window; the location of a window (i.e., the descriptive material does not reconfigure the rendering). Thus, this

descriptive material will not distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art in terms of patentability, see *In re Gulack*, 703 F.2d 1381, 1385, 217 USPQ 401, 404 (Fed. Cir. 1983); *In re Lowry*, 32 F.3d 1579, 32 USPQ2d 1031 (Fed. Cir. 1994).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to render any window in any location because the window location for the ad does not alter the rendering functionality and because the subjective interpretation of the data does not patentably distinguish the claimed invention.

14. Claims 33-34, 39-41, 74-75 and 80-82, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dwight Merriman (U.S. Patent No. 5,948,061 and Merriman hereinafter) in view of Franklin Servan-Schreiber (U.S. Patent No. 6,892,354 and Servan-Schreiber hereinafter).

Regarding Claims 33-34, 39-41, 74-75 and 80-82 Merriman reference discloses all of the claimed subject matter set forth above, except it does not explicitly indicate wherein the act of submitting a request for at least one content-relevant ad to the content-relevant ad server occurs before a request for the requested document. However, Servan-Schreiber discloses wherein the act of submitting a request for at least one content-relevant ad to the content-relevant ad server occurs before a request for the requested document (Col 3, Lines 56-67).

Given the intended broad application of Merriman's system, It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to modify the teachings of Merriman with the teachings of Servan-Schreiber to include the feature of submitting a request for at least one content-relevant ad to the content-relevant ad server occurs before a request for the requested document to keep the user or the requester interested in document or the web site he/she requested by presenting and/or displaying advertisements to the user or the requester while the requested web site is downloading, especially for those advertisements that are significantly small in size comparing to the size of a web site.

***Other Prior Art Made of Record***

15. a. Megiddo et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6892181) discloses a system and method for improving the effectiveness of web advertising; and
- b. Cezaret al. (U.S. Patent No. 6584492) discloses an Internet banner advertising process and apparatus having scalability.

***Conclusion***

16. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to Applicant's disclosure.

***Points of Contact***

17. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Haythim J. Alaubaidi whose telephone number is (571) 272-4014. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 8:00 AM to 4:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Safet Metjahic, can be reached on (571) 272-4023.

Any response to this office action should be mailed to:

The Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks, Washington, D.C. 20231 or Faxed at our central fax number (571) 273-8300.

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to the Customer Service Window of the Randolph Building at 401 Dulany Street, Alexandria, VA 22314

*Haythim J. Alaubaidi*

  
FRANTZ COBY  
PRIMARY EXAMINER

---

Patent Examiner  
Technology Center 2100  
Art Unit 2161